

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science
Minutes of Meeting 92-6
of the
Engineering and Computer Science Faculty Council
held
Friday, November 20, 1992

Present: Professors F.D. Hamblin (Chair), V.S. Alagar, B. Ashtakala, C. Bédard, R.B. Bhat, S. Cheung, P.P. Fazio, J.C. Giguère, K. Ha-Huy, A.M. Hanna, K. Khorasani, T. Krepec, V.N. Latinovic, J. Opatrny, M.O.M. Osman, R.V. Patel, T. Radhakrishnan, R. Shinghal, T. Stathopoulos, K. Thulasiraman, G.D. Xistris; G.H. Vatistas (Graduate Studies), D. Bauer (ECA-CSD), O. Kaseir (ECA-ECED), T.L. Swift (Registrar's Office), Lee Harris (Library); J.L. Hall (Secretary).

Absent with

apology: Profs. M.N.S. Swamy, T. Fancott, A. Krzyzak, O.A. Pekau; Maria Cinquino.

Visitors: Prof. S.V. Hoa.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. R.B. Bhat asked that "Election Procedures" be added to the Agenda and discussed as the first item following this.

**Motion
92-6-1** The agenda, as modified above, was unanimously adopted.

2. Election Procedures

Dr. R.B. Bhat speaking in his capacity of Chairman of the Faculty Election and Tenure Election committees, stated that a letter dated November 16, 1992 had been received from one professor concerning two aspects of the elections which had closed on November 19, 1992.

The items being challenged in the elections were:

- The security of the ballot box;
- The ballot forms for the FTC and FPC which stated "Choose n Only" instead of "Choose up to n".

Dr. Bhat explained that the wording of the ballot had been responded to in a letter issued on November 17 from the Committee addressed to all voters explaining that those who were misled by the wording could submit revised ballots during the voting period.

The professor submitted another letter to him on November 18, 1992 stating that the explanatory note was not satisfactory and that an election - once started - should either be permitted to continue with no alterations or be terminated and replaced. The professor stated that since a reply on the other issues had not been received, he was not voting and requested the Elections Committee meet to review the validity of the process.

Dr. Bhat stated that in view of these complaints, the counting of ballots had not taken place and the Elections Committee had decided to bring the matter to Faculty Council before proceeding with the counting.

During the ensuing discussion, the following points were made by various members of Council:

- These challenges were a matter of legal opinion or interpretations.
- The elections were carried out in good faith and the explanatory letter did not affect the outcome.
- That the elections were run in accordance with the Collective Agreement and that if an appeal were to be made, it would delay the appointments. Also that, in the case of the FTC, elections are to be held on or before November 21 according to the Collective Agreement. Any further FTC election would be after that date.
- That to hold a re-election now would make a farce of the elections already held.

Motion
92-6-2

It was moved that Council authorize the Faculty Elections and Tenure Elections Committees: (1) to seek an opinion from the Office of the Secretary General concerning the potential legality of the elections if the ballots are counted and (2) empower the committees to make a decision as to what action should be taken following this consultation.

The vote was as follows: 12 in favour, 3 against and 4 abstentions.

CLOSED SESSION



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

END OF CLOSED SESSION

4. Adoption of Minutes

**Motion
92-6-5**

After noting some errors and omissions to the attendance list and a typographical error, the minutes of the meeting of October 16, 1992 (92-5) were adopted unanimously. It was noted that although the statement in parenthesis at the top of page 5 was reported correctly, the rule (concerning dropping of courses if they have not been given for three years) applied throughout the entire Faculty and not just to the Department of Mechanical Engineering.

5. Chair's Remarks

Prof. Hamblin stated that an Advisory Committee to the Centre for Continuing Education was being established to advise the Centre on matters of planning and priorities. The Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science has been asked to appoint a faculty representative to sit on the committee. The name of Profs. Hugh McQueen and Richard Guy were suggested by Dr. Fazio as potential representatives. Prof. Hamblin stated that he would advise the Dean of those suggested names.

Prof. Hamblin stated that although there are several proposals to name medals after those who died as a result of the August 24 shootings, these suggestions will be dealt with as part of a total review of the awarding of medals and prizes at the January meeting of Council.

6. Concordia Centre for Composites

Dr. Osman advised Council that the proposal to establish a Centre for Composite Materials has returned to Faculty Council following a review by the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee in accordance with Senate Policies and Procedures for the Establishment of Research Centres. He reported that all of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations had been incorporated into the proposal which had been distributed as ECFC Doc. 92-6-1.

Motion 92-6-6 Dr. Osman moved and Dr. Xistris seconded that the proposal to establish the Concordia Centre for Composites (CONCOM) be approved by Faculty Council and sent to Senate Research Committee for approval.

Dr. Fazio asked Dr. Hoa to comment on the report. Dr. Hoa stated that there had been several minor changes to the report that was presented to Faculty Council 6 months ago. He stated that the external members of the Ad Hoc Committee were very enthusiastic about the proposal and felt that Concordia was well placed to establish such a Centre.

A Councillor noted that item 3 of the Ad Hoc Committee's report refers to a \$10,000 grant and stated that it is assumed that this was an on-going grant not just for the first year. The ensuing discussion concluded that if the Committee approved the proposal, they must have concluded that it was on-going. Nevertheless, if it was a first year only then the \$10,000 should come from the Dean's grant thereafter.

Motion 92-6-7 A motion to call the question with the understanding that the \$10,000 was on-going was passed by a majority vote.

Motion 92-6-7 was then passed unanimously.

7. **Adjournment**

Motion 92-6-8 A motion to adjourn was carried.